Statistical Challenges of 21st Century Cosmology
Proceedings IAU Symposium No. 306, 2014
A. Heavens, J.-L. Starck & A. Krone-Martins, eds.
© 2014 International Astronomical Union
DOI: 00.0000/X000000000000000X

The Value of H_0 from Gaussian Processes

Vinicius C. Busti[1], Chris Clarkson[1] and Marina Seikel[2,1]

[1] Astrophysics, Cosmology & Gravity Centre (ACGC), and Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South Africa
email: vinicius.busti@iag.usp.br

[2] Physics Department, University of Western Cape, Cape Town 7535, South Africa

arXiv:1407.5227v1 [astro-ph.CO] 19 Jul 2014

Abstract. A new non-parametric method based on Gaussian Processes (GP) was proposed recently to measure the Hubble constant H_0. The freedom in this approach comes in the chosen covariance function, which determines how smooth the process is and how nearby points are correlated. We perform coverage tests with a thousand mock samples within the ΛCDM model in order to determine what covariance function provides the least biased results. The function Matérn(5/2) is the best with sligthly higher errors than other covariance functions, although much more stable when compared to standard parametric analyses.

Keywords. methods: statistical, (cosmology:) cosmological parameters, (cosmology:) large-scale structure of universe, cosmology: observations, cosmology: theory, (cosmology:) distance scale

1. Introduction

The difference between the value of the Hubble constant H_0 determined by *Planck* (Planck Collaboration 2013) and by local measurements (Riess et al. 2011) shows a 2.3σ tension. In order to understand what could generate such a discrepancy, many attempts in the literature were done searching for new physics or systematic errors (e.g. Marra et al. 2013, Spergel et al. 2013, Efstathiou 2014, Wyman et al. 2014, Holanda et al. 2014, Clarkson et al. (2014)).

Recently, we proposed a new method to determine H_0 by applying *Gaussian Processes* (GP), which is a non-parametric procedure, to reconstruct $H(z)$ data and extrapolating to redshift zero (Busti et al. 2014). We selected 19 $H(z)$ measurements (Simon et al. 2005, Stern et al. 2010, Moresco et al. 2012) based on cosmic chronometers and obtained $H_0 = 64.9 \pm 4.2$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, which is compatible with *Planck* but shows a tension with local measurements.

Here, we use mock samples in order to test our method. Basically, we are interested to see which covariance function adopted in the GP analysis provides the best match with the fiducial cosmological model. As we shall see, the Matérn(5/2) performs better, with the standard squared exponential covariance function underestimating the errors. In the next section GP will be briefly described, showing our results in Sec. 3. We draw our conclusions and discuss future improvements in Sec. 4.

2. Gaussian Processes (GP)

A gaussian process allows one to reconstruct a function from data without assuming a parametrisation for it. While a gaussian distribution is a distribution over random variables, a gaussian process is a distribution over functions. We use GaPP (Gaussian Processes in Python)† (Seikel et al. 2012)) in order to reconstruct the Hubble parameter as a function of the redshift.

† http://www.acgc.uct.ac.za/~seikel/GAPP/index.html

Basically, the reconstruction is given by a mean function with gaussian error bands, where the function values at different points z and $\tilde{z}$ are connected through a covariance function $k(z, \tilde{z})$. This covariance function depends on a set of hyperparameters. For example, the general purpose squared exponential (Sq. Exp.) covariance function is given by

$$k(z, \tilde{z}) = \sigma_f^2 \exp\left\{-\frac{(z-\tilde{z})^2}{2l^2}\right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

In the above equation we have two hyperparameters, the first σ_f is related to typical changes in the function value while the second l is related to the distance one needs to move in input space before the function value changes significantly. We follow the steps of Seikel et al. (2012) and determine the maximum likelihood value for σ_f and l in order to obtain the value of the function. In this way, we are able to reconstruct the Hubble parameter as a function of the redshift from $H(z)$ measurements. Many choices of covariance function are possible, and we consider a variety below.

3. Results

The freedom in the GP approach comes in the covariance function. While in traditional parametric analyses we choose a model to characterise what is our prior belief about the function in which we are interested, with GP we ascribe in the covariance function our priors about the expected function properties (e.g. smoothness, correlation scales etc.).

We consider the Sq. Exp. covariance function and three examples from the Matérn family:

$$k(z, \tilde{z}) = \sigma_f^2 \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\nu(z-\tilde{z})^2}}{l}\right)^{\nu} K_\nu \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\nu(z-\tilde{z})^2}}{l}\right), \tag{3.1}$$

where K_ν is a modified Bessel function and we choose $\nu = 5/2$, $7/2$ and $9/2$ (see Seikel & Clarkson 2013 for more discussions). Writing $\nu = p + 1/2$, each Matérn function is p times differentiable as are functions drawn from it, and the squared exponential is recovered for $\nu \to \infty$. Increasing ν increases the width of the covariance function near the peak implying stronger correlations from nearby points for a fixed correlation length ℓ. For comparison purposes, we also consider two standard parametric models: a flat ΛCDM model and a flat XCDM model.

The results are shown in Table 1 together with the constraints from the 19 $H(z)$ data. The coverage test of each covariance function and parametric model was performed by creating 1000 mock catalogues of 19 data points with the same redshifts and error-bars of the measured points in a fiducial ΛCDM model. For each model realisation a value of H_0 was derived. The third and fourth columns of Table 1 show the frequency the true value for H_0 was recovered inside the 1σ and 2σ regions. So, for example, the Matérn(9/2) covariance function captures the true value at $1(2)\sigma$ about 60%(94%) of the time – alternatively, the $1(2)\sigma$ region should be interpreted as a 60%(94%) confidence interval. This provides a way to re-normalise the $n\sigma$ intervals for a given covariance function and a prior model assumption, which we show between parentheses for 1σ(68%) errors in Table 1. Therefore, this is an attempt to quantify a possible systematic error from the covariance functions *assuming the true model is ΛCDM*. We also considered some different fiducial models with a time-varying dark energy equation of state, 64 data points in the redshift range $0.1 < z < 1.8$, with coverages showing the same pattern as depicted in Table 1. It is important to note this is a model-dependent comparison which relies on the knowledge

Table 1. H_0 constraints from 19 $H(z)$ measurements.

Method	$H_0 \pm 1\sigma$ (km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1})	Coverage 1σ	Coverage 2σ
Sq. Exp.	$64.9 \pm 4.2(5.9)$	0.527	0.905
Matérn(9/2)	$65.9 \pm 4.5(5.6)$	0.594	0.939
Matérn(7/2)	$66.4 \pm 4.7(5.7)$	0.610	0.946
Matérn(5/2)	$67.4 \pm 5.2(5.5)$	0.665	0.959
ΛCDM	68.9 ± 2.8	0.676	0.938
XCDM	69.0 ± 6.7	0.685	0.939

of the true model in advance, which is never the case, and changes with the quality of the data. The coverage can change with a different underlying model as well – but note that the errors are actually much more stable than switching from ΛCDM to XCDM.

4. Conclusions

We have applied GP to reconstruct $H(z)$ data and from it extrapolate to redshift zero to obtain H_0 (Busti et al. 2014). Based on a set of 1000 mock samples, we have tested the method assuming a fiducial flat ΛCDM model by considering four different covariance functions and applying a coverage test. We have shown Matérn(5/2) represents better the errors, with errors slightly higher than the other covariance functions. A heuristic method to recalibrate the errors for different covariance functions was also provided within the ΛCDM model.

Possible improvements can be achieved by marginalizing over the hyperparameters and comparing the results using Bayesian model comparison tools, which will allow a direct assessment of performance with no need to rely on a fiducial model.

References

Busti, V. C., Clarkson, C. & Seikel, M. 2014, *MNRAS* (Letters) 441, L11 [preprint(arXiv:1402.5429)]

Clarkson, C., Umeh, O., Maartens, R. & Durrer, R. 2014, preprint(arXiv:1405.7860)

Efstathiou, G. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 1138

Holanda, R. F. L., Busti, V. C. & Pordeus da Silva, G. 2014, *MNRAS* (Letters), 443, L74 [preprint(arXiv:1303.5076)]

Marra, V., Amendola, L., Sawicky, I., & Walkenburg, W. 2013, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110, 241305

Moresco, M. et al. 2012, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.*, 8, 6

Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R. et al. 2013, preprint(arXiv:1303.5076)

Riess, A. G. et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 730, 119

Seikel, M., Clarkson, C. & Smith, M. 2012, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.*, 6, 36

Seikel, M. & Clarkson, C. 2013, preprint(arXiv:1311.6678)

Simon, J., Verde, L. & Jimenez, R. 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 123001

Spergel, D., Flauger, R. & Hlozek, R. 2013, preprint(arXiv:1312.3313)

Stern, D., Jimenez, R., Verde, L., Kamionkowski, M. & Stanford, S. A. 2010, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.*, 2, 8

Wyman, M., Rudd, D. H., Vanderveld, A. & Hu, W. 2014, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 112, 051302